

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vinginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/084,232 | 02/28/2002 | Leslie Dort | A889577US | 7803 |
| 7: | 590 05/09/2003 | | | |
| D. Doak Horne c/o Gowlings Lafleur Henderson LLP Suite 1400 | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | BROWN, MI | BROWN, MICHAEL A |
| 700 - 2nd Stree Calgary, AB T | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| CANADA | | | 3764 | 2 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003 | 9 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | - / 1 |
|--|--|
| | Application No. (2/074,232 Les/ie Dout |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner Michael Brown 3764 |
| -The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address— |
| Period for Reply | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION. | T TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE |
| from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by de Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by | FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. fault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent |
| Status | |
| ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on | · |
| ☐ This action is FINAL. | |
| Since this application is in condition for allowance exc accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1 | ept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in 935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213. |
| Disposition of Claims | |
| | is/are pending in the application. |
| * * | is/are withdrawn from consideration. |
| | |
| □ Claim(s). | is/are allowed. |
| © Claim(s) 1-13 | is/are rejected. |
| □ Claim(s) | is/are rejected. |
| ☐ Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election |
| ☐ Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement |
| Claim(s) Cla | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. |
| Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner |
| Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner |
| Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). |
| Claim(s) Cla | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). en received. en received in Application No |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). en received. en received in Application No |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). en received. en received in Application No. ents have been received onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). en received. en received in Application No. ents have been received onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). en received. en received in Application No. ents have been received onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). en received. en received in Application No. ents have been received onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) Interview Summary, PTO–413 |
| Claim(s) | is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement is approved disapproved. ojected to by the Examiner r. ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d). en received. en received in Application No. ents have been received onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) Interview Summary, PTO–413 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO–152 |

Application/Control Number: 10/084,232

Art Unit: 3764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Forney.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forney in view of Alvarez '734.

Forney discloses in figures 1-5 a device for retaining a tongue, substantially as claimed.

However, Forney does not disclose the device being made of either of the materials recited in claims 4 and 12. Alvarez teaches in figures 1- 18D a device for retaining a tongue comprising a

Application/Control Number: 10/084,232

Art Unit: 3764

flange 36, an aperture (the opening between 23 and 24) and the device is made of polyethylene (col. 5, lines 50-54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the polyethylene material as taught by Alvarez could be substituted for the material as disclosed by Forney because polyethylene is a durable material that will withstand the user biting on the device or inserting his tongue into the protrusion over a long period of time.

Conclusion

- The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fitton and Kulick, each discloses a tongue retention device. Although each of these references discloses pertinent prior art, neither was used to reject any claims, in the first office action.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brown whose telephone number is (703) 308-2682.

M. Brown May 3, 2003

> Michael A. Brown Primary Examiner

Michael q.Br

Page 3